REMARKS

In view of the above amendments and following remarks, reconsideration and further examination are requested.

By the current Amendment, claims 18-35 have been amended and claims 36-134 have been added.

Also, the substitute specification and abstract have been reviewed and revised so as to use language consistent with that now recited in the claims. The revisions have been presented in the form of another substitute specification and abstract. No new matter has been added by these revisions.

And, a formal drawing for Figure 7 has been filed so as to show subject matter now recited in the claims. No new matter has been added by Figure 7.

The Examiner rejected combinations of claims 18-35 as being anticipated by any of Fernwood et al., Sanadi '463, Manns, Kolb et al., Mougin, Sanadi '581 and Picozza et al. These rejections are respectfully traversed and the references relied upon by the Examiner are not applicable with regard to the newly amended and added claims for the following reasons.

The claims now recite a **multi-autoclave**. None of the references relied upon by the Examiner teach or suggest a multi-autoclave, and accordingly, claims 18-134 are allowable over these references.

In this regard, an "autoclave" is generally defined and known in the art as a vessel or chamber within which a chemical reaction can take place under high pressure and high temperature. Thus, in accordance with the instant invention a "multi-autoclave" is defined as chambers defined in a single block, which chambers can be made to be fluid tight relative to one another such that chemical reactions can take place in these chambers, respectively, under high pressure and high temperature.

In **Fernwood et al.**, the apertures 10 are in fluid communication with each other at both ends of the apertures, such that the device of Fernwood et al. cannot function as a multi-autoclave. Similarly, in **Manns** the apertures 54 or 56 are in fluid communication with each other at both ends of these apertures such that the device of Manns cannot function as a multi-autoclave. In **Kolb et al.**, the wells 48 are in fluid communication with one another such that the device of Kolb et al. cannot function as a multi-autoclave. In **Picozza et al.**, this reference is silent with regard to the tubes 18 or 68 being sufficiently sealed so as to allow the device of Picozza et al. to function as a multi-autoclave. In **Mougin**, the openings 2 are in fluid communication with one another such that the device of

Mougin cannot function as a multi-autoclave. And, though the **Sanadi** references disclose devices that are to prevent liquids and gases from being transferred from one chamber to another chamber, there is no description of these devices functioning as multi-autoclaves.

Indeed, because of the construction of these devices, if pressure in the chambers were to exist as does pressure in an autoclave the lids of these devices would deform such that these devices could not operate as multi-autoclaves, and possibly could not even function as a single autoclave. For example, in Sanadi '581 there is no discussion that the lid 120 is sufficiently sturdy by itself to withstand pressures experienced in an autoclave, there is no discussion of any frame or housing reinforcing the device so as to prevent the lid from deforming when subjected to pressure associated with an autoclave, nor is clamp 124 described to be sufficiently strong to maintain lid 120, gasket 116, and plate 104 in an arrangement that enables this device to function under high pressures and high temperatures as an autoclave, let alone a "multi-autoclave" as claimed. Similar deficiencies exist with regard to Sanadi '463 functioning as an autoclave or a multi-autoclave.

Additionally, independent claim 18 also requires that forming part of the multi-autoclave is

> a locking device to force said closure member against said block such that said closure member seals said plural openings in a pressure tight manner.

Such a locking device is not taught or suggested by any of Fernwood et al., Manns, Kolb et al. and Picozza et al.

In this regard, because the apertures 10 of **Fernwood et al.** are in fluid communication with one another, Fernwood et al. does not disclose the locking device as recited in claim 18. Similarly, because the apertures 54 or 56 of **Manns** are in fluid communication with one another, Manns does not disclose the locking device as recited in claim 18. In **Kolb et al.**, there is no device that forms part of the assembly thereof which forces the cover film 20 against the upper rims 49 of the wells 48, and accordingly, the locking device as recited in claim18 is also lacking from Kolb et al. And, in **Picozza et al.**, while platen 28 or 64 does force cover 10 or nodules 52 against either tubes 18 or 68 to seal openings of these tubes, the platen 28 or 64 does not form part of the assembly of Picozza et al., but is rather merely a tool which acts upon this assembly, such that platen 28 or 64 cannot reasonably be said to correspond to the locking device as recited in claim 18.

In view of the above, it is respectfully submitted that claim 18 is not anticipated by any of the references relied upon by the Examiner, such that claims 18-134 are allowable over these references.

Certain of the dependent claims are believed patentable in their own right. Specifically, new claim 38 recites that the locking device includes "threaded fasteners". The significance of using threaded fasteners is that a secure engagement between the closure member and the block is ensured such that a high temperature and pressure is allowed to be maintained within the openings such that the device can function as a multi-autoclave. **Fernwood et al., Manns, Kolb et al., Picozza et al., Sanadi '581 and Sanadi '463** do not disclose threaded fasteners. Also, while **Mougin** does disclose threaded fasteners, as expressed previously, because the openings 2 of Mougin are in fluid communication with one another, i.e. at the end covered by the lid 9, Mougin cannot function as a multi-autoclave.

Additionally, it is respectfully submitted that there would have been no motivation or suggestion for one having ordinary skill in the art to have substituted threaded fasteners for the clamps of the **Sanadi** references, because the Sanadi references actually teach away from using threaded fasteners. In this regard, the clamps of the Sanadi references provide for a quick and simple disassembly of the devices thereof, while threaded fasteners would require more time and effort to be removed such that the quick and simple disassembly of the Sanadi devices would be eliminated were threaded fasteners substituted for the clamps of the Sanadi references. Accordingly, one having ordinary skill in the art would not have been motivated to substitute threaded fasteners for the clamps of the Sanadi references. Regardless, even if it would have been obvious to substitute threaded fasteners for the clamps of the Sanadi references, this would not allow the devices of these references to function as multi-autoclaves because, for reasons as expressed previously, these devices are not designed to function as multi-autoclaves.

For the above reasons, claim 38 is patentable in its own right over the references relied upon by the Examiner.

Additionally, claim 57 recites a "rigid frame" enclosing the block and closure member, and similarily, claim 77 recites a "frame" surrounding the block so as to prevent lateral deformation of the block and ensure that outer ones of the plural openings remain sealed in a pressure tight manner. The frame as recited in claim 57, and the frame as recited in claim 77, allow for operation as a multi-

autoclave to be realized. Support for these frames can be found at page 8, lines 13-15 of the original specification, and at page 10, lines 24-25 of the original specification. None of the references relied upon by the Examiner teach or suggest a frame as recited in either of claims 57 and 77, and accordingly, each of these claims is patentable in its own right over the references relied upon by the Examiner.

Furthermore, claim 117 recites that the locking device comprises fasteners positioned between the plural openings. The positioning of fasteners in such a manner ensures that the openings remain in a fluid tight manner relative to one another even when subjected to high pressures and high temperatures. The only reference that shows fasteners in such positions is Mougin; however, for reasons as expressed above the device of Mougin is not a multi-autoclave. And, in view of Mougin it would not have been obvious to substitute fasteners, located between openings, for the clamps of the Sanadi devices because to do so would remove the Sanadi devices of their quick and easy disassembly. Thus, claim 117 is patentable in its own right.

In view of the above amendments and remarks, it is respectfully submitted that the present application is in condition for allowance and an early Notice of Allowance is earnestly solicited.

If after reviewing this Amendment, the Examiner believes that any issues remain which must be resolved before the application can be passed to issue, the Examiner is invited to contact the Applicant's undersigned representative by telephone to resolve such issues.

Respectfully submitted,

Duncan AKPORIAYE et al.

By: Joseph M. Gorski

Joseph M. Gorski
Registration No. 46,500
Attorney for Applicants

JMG/edg
Washington, D.C. 20006-1021
Telephone (202) 721-8200
Facsimile (202) 721-8250
August 7, 2003